

1171053

Palestine Essays — No. 2

ZIONISM & RACISM

by
Hasan Sa'b, Ph. D.

Palestine Liberation Organization * Research Center

BEIRUT • LEBANON

JANUARY 1968

Contents

I	The Racist Ideology of Zionism	5
II	Arab Reactions to Zionist Racism	11
III	Jewish Reactions to Zionist Racism	16
IV	Zionism Breeds Racial & Ethnic Discrimination	29
V	Epilogue	31

I. THE RACIST IDEOLOGY OF ZIONISM

The essential claim of Zionism is the existence of a race, a **chosen race**, which has not been and should not be assimilated by other races, and which can fulfill its historic destiny only through the assertion of its unique nationhood and the establishment of its particular statehood in Palestine. This is a far more comprehensive claim than the simple **humanitarian** request for a refuge for the victims of anti-Semitic persecution.

The belief in a Jewish race, like the belief in a German race, is a myth. Nonetheless, Zionism has done its utmost to spread this myth among the Jews of the world. Weizmann reports that the Balfour Declaration, in its original text, referred to a national home in Palestine for "the Jewish Race". Brandeis, the late American jurist and onetime Zionist leader, requested the substitution of the term "Jewish People" for "Jewish Race".⁽¹⁾ Brandeis was later criticized by Weizmann for his economic and philanthropic concept of Zionism.⁽²⁾

In the era following the First World War, this belief in Jewish racial distinctiveness had stronger protagonists among East-European than among West-European Jewish leaders. The earliest founders of Zionism came from Eastern Europe. While Jewish leaders in Western Europe were advocating the assimilation of the Jews in the modern nationalities of their respective countries, East-European Jews were calling for the assertion of Jewish nationalism. Their emphasis on Jewish exclusiveness, and the influence of European racialist doctrines, led them to an emotional, an intellectual, and a religious identification of "nationalism" with "racism".

The Jewish sense of exclusiveness is as old as the Old Testament.

1. Weizmann, Chaim, *Trial and Error*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1949, p. 206.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 249.

It has its religious origins. Charles McIlwain noted in *The Growth of Political Thought in the West*:

"The first commandment of the Decalogue, 'Thou shalt have none other gods before me'... made the religion of Jews and Christians an exclusive religion... But there was one fundamental difference that finally emerged between Jews and Christians... As Gibbon says, 'the Jews were a nation; the Christians were a sect.' The exclusiveness of Jews led them to despise and to withdraw from other peoples and their beliefs; the exclusiveness of the Christians' faith, no longer tied to any race or nation, urged them on to make proselytes from other religions... The Jewish faith was exclusive, the Christian religion was both exclusive and militant."⁽¹⁾

Embittered by anti-Semitism, East-European Zionist leaders sought a modern revival of this ancient Jewish sense of exclusiveness. **They resented assimilation and resisted it as fervently as they feared anti-Semitism and fought against it. They sought the revival of a Jewish nation, not the defense of the rights of individual Jews.** "There has never been an organized Zionist effort designed to fight for **equal rights** for Jews in any nation of the world", writes an American rabbi. He continues: "It is fundamental to Zionism that Jews cannot ever and permanently enjoy such rights. The Zionist answer always — everywhere — is **privileged, national** rights for **all** Jews in their 'homeland'. This was clear many years ago in the classical and most authoritative presentation of Zionist philosophy..."⁽²⁾

Zionist philosophy has emphasized the rights of a chosen race, an exclusive nation, rather than the rights of individual human beings. Zionists have spoken of Race, while liberal Jews and assimilationists

-
1. McIlwain, Charles Howard, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1932, p. 145.
 2. Berger, Elmer, *Judaism or Jewish Nationalism. The Alternative to Zionism*, New York, Bookman Associates, 1957, p. 53.

have spoken of Man. Moses Hess was the first modern Jewish thinker to integrate in a new racial philosophy the old and new currents of "Jewish nationalism". He explained this philosophy in his book, *Rome and Jerusalem*, published in 1862. He said :

"... **it was only one people, the people of Israel**, which, thanks to its particular genius, was able to perceive the workings of the divine plan in the history of humanity, as well as in the organic spheres of life... The Jewish people will participate in the great historical movement of present-day humanity only when it will have its own fatherland".⁽¹⁾

Hess believed that the "Jewish people" had survived because it had preserved its "racial instinct". He wrote :

"Fortified by its racial instinct and by its cultural and historical mission to unite all humanity in the name of the Eternal Creator, this people has conserved its nationality in the form of its religion and united both inseparably with the memories of its ancestral land."⁽²⁾

In his book, *Auto-Emancipation*, published in 1892, Leo Pinsker spoke about the "unmixed descent" of all Jews. According to Pinsker, the Jews have "a common, unmixed descent, an indestructible vigor..."⁽³⁾

Ahad Ha'am gave to this new racism a spiritual outlook. He transformed the classical religious idea of a "chosen people" into the modern idea of a Jewish "supernation" :

"The nation of Israel as a **supernation** — the modern version of the chosen people — can in this way be expanded into a true system."

-
1. Hess, Moses, *Rome and Jerusalem, a Study in Jewish Nationalism*, first published in 1862. Edition 1918, New York, 1918, pp. 181, 167.
 2. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
 3. Pinsker, Leo, *Auto-Emancipation*, Washington, D. C., 1944, p. 16.

This system borrowed from Nietzsche the idea of the superman, applying it to a "Jewish nation" which seeks

"some firm resting place... in order that it may have the opportunity once more of developing its genius... and of fulfilling its mission as a supernation."⁽¹⁾

These notions found their most articulate expression in the famous work of Theodor Herzl, *Judenstaat* (or **The Jewish State**). Herzl is the father of contemporary Zionism. In 1897 he organized the first Zionist Congress in Basle. His book is based on the idea that the Jews cannot and should not be assimilated in their homelands. The Jew should not forget his different origin. Whenever he is offered assimilation, even in the best possible conditions, he must refuse it. The Jews have remained one people and a distinctive race, because the laws of marriage have been hindering " ... rather than aiding the fusion of races..." They should hold fast to these differences which have separated them from others. "Their distinctive nationality ... neither can, will or must be destroyed ... Therefore, there is to the Jewish question only one solution, one answer: *Judenstaat*."⁽²⁾

In their formulation of a new ideology, the intellectual and political fathers of Zionism seem to have agreed in their premises with the "anti-Semites", the enemies of the Jews. Zionism, which claims to be the answer to "anti-Semitism", has been guided by these premises, and has organized a world-wide campaign for the racial and nationalist indoctrination of the "Jewish people".

This ironical meeting of minds between Zionists and anti-Semites is cited by the Jewish writer, Alfred M. Lilienthal :

"It is strange that the fallacious obsession of a vanquished enemy should dominate the surviving group's philosophy. It was Hitler

-
1. Bentwich, N. M., *Ahad Ha'am and His Philosophy*, Jerusalem, 1927, p. 13.
 2. Herzl, Theodor, *The Jewish State*, Fourth Edition, London, 1946, pp. 15, 25, 27.

who, in imposing Nazism on country upon country, said : 'You are not a German — you are a Jew. You are not a Czech — you are a Jew. You are not a Pole — you are a Jew ...' And Nazi law defined how many generations back a modicum of special blood would establish future membership in the race ... For Nazism, every German belonged to his distinct and chosen Aryan race. There is no reputable anthropologist who will not agree that Jewish racialism is as much poppycock as Aryan racialism."⁽¹⁾

The concept of a "chosen race", in Zionism, differs from the concept of a "chosen race", in Nazism, only in the identity of that race — the Zionists speaking of a "Jewish race", and the Nazis of an "Aryan race". Racial consciousness led the two ideologies to the belief in a super-race or super-nation, which is endowed with a special historic destiny and called upon to fulfill a unique cultural mission. The antagonism between Judaism and anti-Semitism, and the deadly struggle between Zionism and Nazism, should have made such similarities unthinkable. But anti-Semitism, Zionism and Nazism are different manifestations of a racism and a nationalism which grew up in the same area and in the same intellectual climate.

To the historian, it is no accident that a nineteenth-century Jewish Zionism and a twentieth-century German Neo-anti-Semitism should have arisen successively in the same geographical zone of the Western world, and that this locus should have been the German-speaking territories of the Austrian Empire. Writes Toynbee :

"... This Austrian Zone lay sufficiently far to the west for its Jewish inhabitants to be subject to infection by current Western ideologies — including Nationalism as well as Liberalism... and sufficiently far to the east for its Gentile inhabitants to be no less subject to infection by pre-Liberal Western ideologies still persisting among the backward Gentile populations... and the

1. Lilienthal, Alfred, *What Price Israel*, Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1953, p. 213.

notion that the Western Jews might win for themselves, by adopting Western Nationalism, an asylum which they might prove not to have secured through conversion to Western Liberalism would naturally present itself to the minds of Austrian Jews whose nineteenth-century status of individual emancipation was threatened by the simultaneous onsets of a Modern Gentile Nationalism from Western Europe and a Medieval Gentile Anti-semitism from 'the Pole'."⁽¹⁾

Anti-Semites and Zionists drew from the irrational sources of modern nationalism much more than they drew from the rational. They both doubted the possibility of the assimilation of the Jew even in Western liberal societies. Herzl saw anti-Semitism surviving "as a result of the emancipation of the Jews". It can never vanish; and he "who founded his hope for improved conditions on the ultimate perfection of humanity would indeed be painting a Utopia."⁽²⁾ Similarly, the anti-Semite believes that Jewish exclusiveness will not change, with emancipation or without it. The Zionist maintains that the anti-Semitic prejudices of the Gentiles will never disappear. **Their common ground is a profound distrust of human nature and human reason.**

In spite of their mutually antagonistic purposes, anti-Semites and Zionists were led by this common distrust of human nature to the same practical conclusion: The Jew can never be accepted among the Gentiles; therefore, he should have a separate territory of his own. This was the conclusion reached in *Judenstaat* by Herzl, the chief spokesman for Zionism. It was also the conclusion reached by Rosenberg, the chief spokesman for anti-Semitism and Nazism.

-
1. Toynbee, Arnold, *A Study of History*, Vol. 8, London, Oxford University Press, 1963, pp. 294-295.
 2. Herzl. *The Jewish State*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

II. ARAB REACTIONS TO ZIONIST RACISM

The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Levi Eshkol, stated in London in March, 1965, that Israel's goal is to become a country of four to five million people. In the same statement, Mr. Eshkol reaffirmed Israel's determination to close the doors of Israeli-occupied Palestine to the Palestinian Arabs, who are now refugees in the neighboring countries. It appears from this statement — which is only the most recent of many similar statements made by Israeli officials — that Israel, which now has a population of over two millions, is believed by its leaders to be still capable of absorbing two or three more million Jewish immigrants. But Israel is not deemed, by its leaders, to be capable of allowing the Palestinian Arabs to return to their own homes in Palestine. The cause of this refusal, given by Mr. Eshkol, is that the Palestinians "will only come back as enemies."⁽¹⁾

Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel and one of the founders of the world Zionist movement, wrote in his autobiography: "I am certain that the world will judge the Jewish State by what it will do with the Arabs..."⁽²⁾ Israel has denied the Arab people of Palestine the right of repatriation to their own homeland. Since 1948, the year of the proclamation of Israel as a state, this right has been reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in no less than sixteen formal resolutions.

This denial of a basic human right is symbolic of the general Israeli attitude towards the Arabs. In Palestine, as in the rest of the Middle East and North Africa, Jews and Arabs lived in peace and friendship for more than two thousand years. The Zionist movement, which started in Europe in the nineteenth century, and which culminated in the forcible creation of the state of Israel, has transformed this friendship into hostility and animosity.

-
1. "Israeli PM Tells Frank Giles", *Sunday Times*, (London), 28 March. 1965.
 2. Weizmann, Chaim, *Trial and Error*, *op. cit.*, p. 462.

This Jewish-Arab animosity is a new phenomenon in the history of the area. **While the Prime Minister of Israel, and Israelis and Zionists in general, look upon Palestinian Arabs as enemies, Arabs (Palestinian and non-Palestinian alike) have looked upon Jews as members of the great community of the "People of the Book", i.e., the Monotheistic Community encompassing Jews, Christians, and Muslims.**

Zionism has been the initiator of this new Jewish-Arab animosity, and the promoter of antagonism between Jews and Arabs. The American scholar, Dr. Millar Burrows, Professor of Biblical Theology at Yale University, stated in his book, *Palestine Is Our Business*, that Jewish-Arab animosity is "a relatively new thing but now so deep and bitter that it will not be removed for generations, if ever." It is "rooted in the fear aroused by the strangeness, the manifest ability, and, **above all, the aggressiveness of the Zionist colonists.**"⁽¹⁾ The contrast between the state of Jewish-Arab relations in the past and in the present is striking. In the past, says Professor Burrows, the Arabs, "as compared with the Western nations, ... have shown relatively little antagonism for Jews as such. Maimonides, revered by Jews the world over as the second Moses, was personal physician to the son of Saladin, King Richard's great antagonist."⁽²⁾

The same view, regarding Jewish-Arab relations before the rise of Zionism, is shared by Jewish scholars. The Jewish historians of the nineteenth century were deeply embittered by the contrast between the enlightened ideas of that century and the denial of civic rights to Jews in many European countries. Ceraetz, the author of a ten-volume classic history of the Jews, "pointed out most emphatically, that the legal and actual position of the Jews during the Middle Ages was much better in the Muslim-Arab countries than in Christian Europe ; and the 'Golden Age' of Judaism in Muslim Spain has become a phrase which

-
1. Burrows, Millar, *Palestine Is Our Business*, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, pp. 43-44 (Emphasis added).
 2. *Ibid*, p. 43.

has found its way even into the most popular accounts of Jewish history".⁽¹⁾ Allen H. Godbey, Old Testament Professor at Duke University, referring to the existence of a million Sephardic Jews in Arab Spain, states that "Sephardic superiority was the product of a freedom that Christian Europe was not according the Jew."⁽²⁾

The opinions of these scholars are supported by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which states in its article on "Jews" :

"In the 7th century, there was a simultaneous wave of forced conversion of the Jews throughout Europe from Constantinople to Toledo, reaching its height under the Visigoths in Spain where the practice of Judaism was proscribed. It was the Arab invasion which brought salvation. The ancient communities in Northern Africa, especially at Cairo and Karouan, which had waned under Byzantine intolerance, awakened to a new life. In Spain there came about a remarkable revival. The Jews knew no restrictions."

The rise of modern Zionism was the historic turning-point in Jewish-Arab relations. The major cause of the change was the objective which Zionism set for itself : the creation of a Jewish national state in an Arab land, Palestine. When Zionism chose this objective at its first Congress (at Basle in 1897), Palestine was an Ottoman province populated by Christian and Muslim Arabs. Thus when, on November 2, 1917, during the First World War, Great Britain issued the Balfour Declaration, promising the Zionists a national home in Palestine, the British were disposing of a land which belonged neither to them nor to the Zionists.

The Jewish author, Arthur Koestler, describes the Balfour Declaration as :

-
1. Goitein, S. D. (Chairman, School of Oriental Studies, Hebrew University) *Jews and Arabs*, Shoken Books, New York, 1955, p. 7.
 2. Godbey, Allen H., *The Last Tribes : A Myth*, p. 154.

“... one of the most unusual political documents of all times. In this document, a first nation promises... a second nation a land which belongs to a third nation. . . The Arabs were in Palestine under Ottoman rule. But, they lived in it for centuries. **Evidently, Palestine was their homeland.**”(1)

We find that, from the start, Zionism aimed at the transformation of this Palestinian Arab homeland into an Israeli homeland. Addressing the Peace Conference in Paris in February 1919, Weizmann declared that the goal of Zionism was that Palestine “... would ultimately become as Jewish as England is English.”(2) This goal could not be achieved without dispossessing the Arab people of Palestine. Weizmann’s colleagues, the members of the Zionist delegation to the Peace Conference, realized this. All were “profoundly embarrassed”, as one of them, the French member of the delegation, Sylvain Levi, confessed. He had the courage to warn the Peace Conference that :

“Palestine was a small and a poor land, that it already had a population of six hundred thousand Arabs, that the Jews... would tend to dispossess them... ” (3)

Thus, Levi gave the Conference a prophetic definition of the aggressive essence of Zionism, and predicted the tragic story of Palestine. He saw from the start that the realization of Zionist aspirations in Palestine would necessarily lead to a total invasion by a foreign people of the land of another people. In this invasion, which culminated in the proclamation of the state of Israel in 1948, “the Zionists have been inclined to adopt almost any means for the fulfillment of their ends”(4)

In 1917, when the British occupied Palestine and began the implementation of the Balfour Declaration, the population of the country was

-
1. Koestler, Arthur, *Analyse d'un Miracle*, tr., Dominique Aury, Paris, 1949, p. 17.
 2. Weizmann, Trial and Error *op. cit.*, p. 244.
 3. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
 4. Taylor, Alan R., *Prelude to Israel*, New York, Philosophical Library, 1959, p. 113.

approximately 700,000, of whom only 56,000 were Jews ; the remainder were Muslim and Christian Arabs. The Jews then owned only two and one-half percent of the land, or 162,500 acres out of a total area of 6,580,755 acres. In May, 1948, when Israel was proclaimed a state, the Jews owned 5.67 percent of the total land area of Palestine. Today, the vast majority of Muslim and Christian Palestinian Arabs are refugees outside Palestine. Some two million Jewish immigrants have occupied their lands and their homes.

This Zionist invasion of the Holy Land took place in the twentieth century, which has otherwise witnessed the end of colonial conquests of Asian and African lands.

This aggressive essence of the Zionist ideology is the major cause of Israeli-Arab animosity. "It was not until the Jewish underground forces began to clean up Arab resistance in Palestine... that the Arabs realized what daring, skill, and ruthlessness they were up against."⁽¹⁾ To dispossess the Palestinian Arabs, all means were sanctioned—from illegal immigration, to expropriation, to massive massacres, to individual assassinations. The British authorities in Palestine, the Zionist terrorists, and the Israeli authorities all played their respective roles in forcing the Arab people of Palestine into a mass exodus. This Palestinian exodus came as the logical result of the Zionist determination to conquer Palestine. The atrocities committed by the Israelis in 1948 were only an episode in the systematic Zionist program aimed at the dispossession of the Palestinian Arabs. In Toynbee's famous words, "this calamity that overtook the Palestinian Arabs in A. D. 1948 was on the heads of Zionist Jews who seized a Lebensraum for themselves in Palestine by force of arms."⁽²⁾

-
1. Cremeans, Charles D., *The Arabs and the World*, published for the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 1963, p. 182.
 2. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, *op. cit.*, p. 290 (footnote 2).

III. JEWISH REACTIONS TO ZIONIST RACISM

The State of Israel has emerged not as a humanitarian refuge, but as the incarnation of a neo-racism, which discriminates between Jews and Arabs, between Zionist and anti-Zionist Jews, and even between Western and Eastern Israeli citizens. Outstanding Jewish thinkers (including Einstein, Cohen, Rosenwald and Magnes) recognized the racial, narrow-minded, chauvinistic, isolationist, and totalitarian-nationalist elements of Zionism, and warned against their consequences. Their criticism is all the more valuable to us because they were not all anti-Zionists: Rosenwald is indeed an avowed anti-Zionist, but Magnes was a Zionist and Einstein and Cohen were non-Zionists rather than anti-Zionists. Their common ground, despite their differences on Zionism, is their deep faith in the universal outlook of Judaism. Moreover, they all distinguish between the humanitarian and philanthropic needs of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution and the excessive nationalistic Zionist claims. They all agree that, in these claims, Zionism emulates Nazism and breeds new forms of anti-Semitism.

On the death of Weizmann, the first President of Israel, Professor Albert Einstein declined the offer made to him by the Israeli Government to become President of Israel.⁽¹⁾ Dr. Ezriel Carlebach, Editor of the Israeli newspaper, *Maarif*, nominated Einstein with the assertion that: "He belongs to us, not to Princeton University." This, however, was not Einstein's conviction. As a good Jew, and a genuine liberal, he could not see the need for a Jewish national state. Asked by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, in January 1946, whether refugee settlement in Palestine demanded a Jewish state, Einstein said:

"The State idea is not according to my heart, I cannot understand why it is needed. It is connected with narrow-mindedness and economic obstacles. I believe it is bad. I have always been against it."⁽²⁾

He described the Jewish Commonwealth concept as "an imitation of

1. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

Europe, the end of which was brought about by nationalism."⁽¹⁾ After the rise of Israel, he reiterated the same view in his book, *Out of My Later Years* :

"I should much rather see a reasonable agreement with the Arabs on the basis of living together than the creation of a Jewish state. Apart from practical considerations, my awareness of the essential nature of Judaism resists the idea of a Jewish state, with borders, an army, and a measure of temporal power no matter how modest. I am afraid of the inner damage Judaism will sustain."⁽²⁾

In his book on Einstein, Professor Philipp Frank explains this opposition to a "Jewish state" as the expression of Einstein's deep concern that the Jews would follow the example of their persecutors, the Nazis, and would thus be "substituting a Jewish nationalism for German Nationalism."⁽³⁾

Einstein was deeply sympathetic to the tragedy of his fellow Jews. But he did not see in Zionism or in Israel the proper answer to Jewish needs. He was disturbed by Zionism's blindness to the seriousness of the problem of Arab-Israeli relations. He made several statements to affirm that he "had never been a Zionist and had never supported the creation of the state of Israel." He was anxious to remind Zionist leaders that they could not overlook Arab rights in Palestine. In a conversation with Weizmann, Einstein asked him : "What about the Arabs if Palestine were given to the Jews ?" And Weizmann replied : "What Arabs ? They are hardly of any consequence."⁽⁴⁾

This disregard for the rights of others is a characteristic of nationalist movements which are totally absorbed in their own emotions,

1. *Ibid.*

2. Einstein, Albert, *Out of My Later Years*, New York, Philosophical Library, 1950 , quoted in *What Price Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

3. Frank, Philipp, *Einstein*, New York, Knopf, 1947, quoted in *What Price Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

4. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

prejudices, drives, and objectives. It is a symptom of totalitarian nationalism. Zionism grew in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the midst of such nationalisms. In its propaganda to non-Jews, Zionism laid the emphasis on its philanthropic character. In its appeal to Jews, it laid the emphasis on the racial, national, cultural and religious unity of the "Jewish people". Like Einstein, other liberal Jewish thinkers have questioned the validity of such an emphasis.

In a study on *Zionism, Tribalism or Liberalism*, Morris R. Cohen, Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University, wrote :

"Zionism is not merely a philanthropic movement to help the homeless. It claims to be a solution of the Jewish problem ; and its emphasis on Palestine rests on a nationalist philosophy which is a direct challenge to all those who believe in liberalism."⁽¹⁾

The rise of Zionism stemmed from several motives, of which the rescue of persecuted Jews is only one. "Like all practical human movements, Zionism has its roots in a variety of complicated human motives, varying from the idealistic and religious to those of frustrated personal and social ambition."⁽²⁾ The Zionists oppose not only anti-Semitism, but also the liberal assimilation of the Jews in democratic societies. Like Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Freud, Bergson and Einstein, Cohen is an advocate of this assimilation. He shares with these Jewish thinkers their view :

"... that Jews like other groups are held together by the bond of common sufferings ; and that, as the nations become enlightened and remove their restrictions against the Jews, the latter would adopt the habits of Western civilization and the problem would be thus eliminated."⁽³⁾

Zionism does not subscribe to this liberal outlook. Its outlook is nationalistic and racialistic :

-
1. Cohen, Professor Morris R., *Zionism, Tribalism or Liberalism*, New York, 1946, p. 4.
 2. *Ibid.*
 3. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

"The constant tendency to emphasize the consciousness of race, tragically intensified by the increased persecutions of recent years, has ... led newly emancipated Jews to adopt the very popular racial philosophy of history, represented on the Teutonic side by Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, or, on the Russian side, by Slavophiles like Katkoff. Zionists fundamentally accept the racial ideology of these anti-Semites but draw different conclusions. Instead of the Teuton, it is the Jew that is the pure or superior race. Zionists always speak of themselves as idealists ... The word 'idealism' covers a multitude of sins, and one of these is a disinclination to look actual difficult problems in the face and a tendency to take refuge, instead, in arbitrary dreams ... **The idealistic Zionists are quite willing to ignore the rights of the non-Jewish population of Palestine, almost like the Teutonic idealists with their superior culture.**"⁽¹⁾

Like Einstein, Cohen saw that Zionism was reproducing a new form of racism. He also saw that this racism was leading Zionists to a total disregard for the rights of other people. His fears were confirmed by his observation of the establishment of the "Jewish" state in Palestine. In a Postscript to his early remarks about Zionism, which he published twenty-six years later, he said: "Tribalism is a creed that leads to grief and massacre, whether it bears the label of Zionism, Aryanism, or Anglo-Saxon America ..." Then, refuting the argument of those who justify tribal Zionism on the grounds of its achievements in Palestine, he said:

"... just as crimes may be committed in the name of liberty, so good deeds may be done under the banners of a false creed ... These achievements ... did not presuppose the establishment of a Jewish state, and I trust that they may be advanced and extended in years to come within the framework of a non-sectarian state that allows equal rights to all — Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, and atheists alike."⁽²⁾

-
1. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
 2. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Israel is a sectarian state. It does not recognize the equality of rights which has been advocated with great passion by distinguished liberal Jewish thinkers like Professor Cohen. The Israelis fail also to see that they are applying in Israel the same discrimination from which they suffered in the Diaspora. "This century has witnessed many a tragic and fantastic spectacle, but none perhaps more bizarre than a government of atheistic socialists combined with theocratic fundamentalists, maintained by American and British capitalists."⁽¹⁾ This is a description of Israel by a Jewish writer, the late Henry Hurewitz.

The "tragic and bizarre" character of the Israeli adventure is seen by outsiders, not by the Israelis themselves. Self-centered racial consciousness, blind idealism, and boastful pride preclude constructive self-criticism. Returning from a visit to Israel, Lessing J. Rosenwald, former President of the American Council for Judaism, pointed out that "isolationism" and "chauvinism" pervert Israeli thinking. To the Israelis, he wrote,

"the world is the boundary of the Israeli borders ... **chauvinism is extreme** ... there is a complete lack of understanding and acceptance of chauvinism in other countries. In Israel it is beneficial and proper, elsewhere it is sinister, baseless and foolish."

Overwhelmed by self-righteousness, the Israelis cannot see the damaging effects of their chauvinism :

"While a great majority of Israeli citizens were targets for oppression in other lands, they are more or less indifferent to the terrible situation in which the Arab refugees find themselves."⁽²⁾

This self-centered, self-righteous posture is symptomatic of an intense racial consciousness. Its intensity springs from old and new psychological and cultural sources. Whether these sources are as old

-
1. Hurewitz, H., "Israel : What Next ?", in *Menorah Journal*, Spring 1954, p. 7.
 2. *News from the American Council for Judaism Inc.*, Feb. 13, 1960. (Emphasis added).

as the Talmud or as new as Herzl's *Judenstaat*, they have been used to stress exclusiveness and particularism. The universal character of Judaism has been distorted to fit the particularistic ends of Zionist neo-racism. Instead of elevating nationalism to the spiritual and ethical standards of Judaism, Zionism has utilized Judaism to serve its own political purposes. The late Dr. Judah Magnes, President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, was one of the few Zionist leaders whose spiritual insight was not altered by Zionist politics. To his mind, Judaism transcended Zionism. In an address delivered at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem on October 29, 1947, he used Judaism to measure Zionism. "He did not, as many do, use Zionism to measure Judaism."⁽¹⁾ Zionism appeared to him a strange totalitarian phenomenon, which is contrary to the universal spirit of Judaism. It is a

"totalitarianism which seeks to subject to its discipline the entire Jewish people and every individual therein, and, if necessary, by force and by violence ... We had always thought ... that Zionism would diminish anti-Semitism in the world. We are witness to the opposite; and are not you and I among the responsible, among the guilty ?"⁽²⁾

* * *

The "racialization" of the Jewish problem by Zionists amounts to a new "Ghettoization". The drive to separate the Jews into a state of their own is only a new manifestation of the Eastern European historic trend to segregate the Jews in ghettos. Jewish writers have observed that "Jewish Nationalism as we now see it at work arose in Eastern and Southeastern Europe because of conditions there. The nations in that part of Europe were organized on the basis of racial and religious groups, each group enjoying group rights. The Jews fought for recognition as a group in order to enjoy the same rights."⁽³⁾ This fight

-
1. Berger, *Judaism or Jewish Nationalism*, op. cit., p. 32.
 2. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-34.
 3. Lazaron, Rabbi Dr. Morris, "The Impact of Jewish Nationalism on Judaism and Jews", Eighth Annual Conference of the American Council for Judaism, Washington, April 4, 1952.

gave rise to a virulent nationalism, which has been denounced by Jewish critics as "a throwback to the narrowest kind of racial exclusiveness and Ghetto tribalism."⁽¹⁾

It is not a mere coincidence that this concept of a new "Jewish Ghetto" should emanate from Eastern European anti-Semites and Zionists, who were not affected by the great movement of emancipation of the Jews in Western Europe and North America. While this movement, which started with the French Revolution, made the Jews equal citizens in their respective countries, "the Ghetto walls of Eastern Europe had not been scaled. Prior to the Hitler mass slaughter, the followers of Judaism throughout the world totalled sixteen millions, and almost one half of them lived in Eastern Europe. For centuries the Jews in Poland had been meticulously organized into 'Kehillahs', governed by their own all-powerful Joint Councils, the Va-ad Arba Aratos. With the three partitions of Poland, Russia inherited the world's largest body of Jews. The Czars confined them to living in Russia's Western provinces within the 'Pale of Settlement' and its strong internal organization. Poland and Russia remained virtually untouched by the emancipation."⁽²⁾

Anti-Semites confined the Jews to separate areas; Zionists have sought to confine them to Palestine. This segregative, racial and territorial solution of the Jewish problem had its early advocates and ardent supporters among Eastern European Jews. Western Jews, having been liberated by the movement of emancipation, rejected the Zionist segregative assumptions, and have refused in their great mass to emigrate to Palestine. They have also criticized the similarity between Zionist and anti-Semitic ideas. The American Jewish rabbi and writer, Dr. Elmer Berger, has been among the most perceptive critics of Zionist conversion to anti-Semitic ideas concerning Jews.

-
1. *Getting Back to Fundamentals*, A sermon preached by Irving F. Reichert, Rabbi, Emeritus of Temple Emmanu-El, San Francisco, at the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1952, for the Eighth Annual Conference of the American Council for Judaism.
 2. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, op. cit., p. 12.

In his book, *The Jewish Dilemma*, he said :

"Jews as well as others denounce the Nazi race ideas, yet some Jews subscribe to the notion that they are a separate people or race whose problems can only be solved by the establishment of a country of their own. If this is so, how does this concept differ from the implications of the Nazi theory that Jews are eternally different — an unintegratable element?... Isn't it a curious thing, and tragically ironic, that Zionists and extreme anti-Semites agree on the same solution — isolate the Jews in a country of their own?"⁽¹⁾

Western Jews rejected the idea of a racial territorial settlement to the Jewish problem when it was first proclaimed by Eastern European Zionist leaders. Western Jews considered themselves emancipated and already settled in their French, British, and American homes. Their interest in Zionism was humanitarian and philanthropic rather than nationalistic. Therefore, Zionism had its early centers in Eastern European countries.

The issuance of the Balfour Declaration by Great Britain during the First World War brought about a shift of the center of Zionism to London. Hitler's massacres of the Jews, during the Second World War, brought about a new shift to the United States. Nevertheless, the interest of Western Jewish leaders in Zionism has continued to be mainly humanitarian, political and financial rather than territorial. Israeli leaders have always complained that even the most ardent Zionists among Western Jews have not shown eagerness to emigrate to Palestine. Only very small numbers of Western European, North American, and Latin American Jews have settled in Israel.

At first, Western Jewish leaders not only disapproved of Herzl's scheme for a Jewish national state, but also actively resisted its implementation. Twelve years after Herzl's Zionism had begun to fascinate Eastern European Jews, the Central Conference of American Rabbis

1. Berger, Elmer, *The Jewish Dilemma*, New York, 1946, pp. 4 & 5

passed a resolution which expressed disapproval of any attempt to establish a Jewish State. The resolution declared: "Such attempts show a misunderstanding of Israel's mission which from the narrow political and national field has been expanded to the promotion among the whole human race of the broad and universalistic religion first proclaimed by the Jewish prophets."⁽¹⁾ The reform congregations likewise voiced their opposition to political Zionism, and reaffirmed the concept of their identity **as a religious community**. They added: "Zionism was a precious possession of the past... As such it is a holy memory, but it is not our hope of the future. America is our Zion."⁽²⁾ Zionism was regarded as a philosophy of foreign origin with little to recommend it to Americans. The Reform Jewish paper, *The American Israeli*, indicated that all Jewish newspapers edited or controlled by native Americans were strongly anti-Zionist. In 1904, this paper noted that "there is not one solitary prominent Jewish-American who is an advocate of Zionism."⁽³⁾

During the First World War, when Weizmann and other Zionist leaders were striving to obtain from the British Government a formal commitment for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, their efforts were opposed and obstructed by British and West-European Jewish leaders. These leaders were mostly assimilationists and anti-Zionists. They were represented in Great Britain and France by the Conjoint Committee and the Alliance Israelite respectively. Weizmann reported that, as far as Zionism was concerned, these two bodies pursued "an almost identical policy . . . This policy can be summed up in one word: 'Opposition'."⁽⁴⁾ They looked upon Zionism as an East-European phenomenon, and upon "Eastern European Jewry as an object of compassion and philanthropy, and upon Zionism as, at best, the empty dream of a few misguided idealists." They were loyal to their

-
1. Cohen, Naomi Wiener, *The Reaction of Reform Judaism in America to Political Zionism*. Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, June, 1951, P. 365.
 2. *Ibid.*, p. 371.
 3. *Ibid.*, p. 368.
 4. Weizmann, *Trial and Error op. cit.*, p- 158.

Jewish faith and their British nationality. They felt "nationalism beneath the religious level of Jews — except in their capacity as Englishmen."⁽¹⁾ When the British Cabinet began its discussion of the draft of the Balfour Declaration, the most vehement critic of the draft was the Jewish member of the Cabinet, Edwin Montagu. At the meeting of the Cabinet he made "a passionate speech against the proposed move." He expressed the deep concern of British Jews over Zionism. "The vehemence with which he urged his views, the implacability of his opposition, astounded the Cabinet... The man almost wept..."⁽²⁾ This "passionate" Jewish Opposition to the draft was about to lead the British Cabinet to its rejection. Political and propagandistic considerations, and the intervention of Colonel House on behalf of President Wilson, prevailed over Jewish opposition. Weizmann describes this intervention as one of "the most important individual factors in breaking the deadlock created by the British Jewish anti-Zionists, and in deciding the British Government to issue its declaration."⁽³⁾ The other decisive factors which led the British Cabinet to override Jewish opposition to the Balfour Declaration were enunciated by the then-British Prime Minister, Lloyd George. In 1937, in a statement to the Palestine Royal Commission, he said :

"The Zionist leaders gave us a definite promise that if the Allies committed themselves to giving facilities for the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine, they would do their best to rally Jewish sentiment and support throughout the world to the Allied cause."⁽⁴⁾

British Jewish leaders, like all anti-Zionist Jewish leaders, were convinced that the problems Zionism would create would be much greater and far more complicated than the problem it purported to solve. They recognized the need to solve the problem of persecuted and displaced Jews in Eastern Europe. But they felt that the racial and territorial Zionist approach was a menace to the gains they had achieved in the

1. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 206.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

4. Berger, Elmer, *The Jewish Dilemma*, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

West through emancipation, liberalism and democracy. The Zionist racist approach would cause a problem of dual loyalty to Western Jews, and would foster anti-Semitism instead of eliminating it. Some were also conscious of the wrong the Zionist policy would inflict upon the Arab people of Palestine. Blinded by their fanaticism, the Zionists paid no heed even to the existence of this people.

Although the British Cabinet overruled its Jewish member, it could not entirely disregard his objections to the principles and draft of the Declaration. This can be seen in the difference between the Balfour Declaration as it was drafted by Zionists leaders, and the Declaration as it was finally adopted by the British Cabinet. The Zionists sought an unconditional British commitment to the transformation of Palestine into a Jewish state, regardless of all the tragic implications of such a transformation. According to Weizmann, this commitment would have been expressed in the following text : " . . . 1. His Majesty's Government accepts the principle that Palestine should be reconstituted as the National Home of the Jewish people. 2. His Majesty's Government will use its best endeavours to secure the achievement of this object and will discuss the necessary methods with the Zionist Organization."⁽¹⁾ This draft discloses the real Zionist intent : the conquest of Palestine under British protection and with British assistance.

Zionist assistance in the war effort appealed to the British, who also hoped the Zionist colonies in Palestine would constitute a British imperialist beachhead to the north of the Suez Canal.⁽²⁾ Nevertheless, the British could not afford to satisfy Zionist territorial ambitions in Palestine by unconditional acceptance of the Zionist claims. Instead, they qualified their pledge of assistance with reservations regarding the rights of the non-Jewish people in Palestine and the rights of Jews outside Palestine. These restrictions were inserted in the final text of the Balfour Declaration which was adopted by the British Cabinet, and which reads as follows : "His Majesty's Government view with favor

1. Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, *op. cit.*, p. 204

2. Taylor, *Prelude to Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish Communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”⁽¹⁾ Indeed, as history has demonstrated, this commitment was self-contradictory. The Zionists’ real objective was irreconcilable with the reservations and safeguards which were incorporated into the Declaration. The alteration of the original draft could not alter the Zionist spirit; neither could it restrain Zionist ambition. Weizmann attributes this change in the text to the pressure of anti-Zionist Jewish leaders. He says: “Certain it was that Montagu’s opposition, coupled with the sustained attacks which the . . . anti-Zionist group had been conducting for months — their letters to the press, the pamphlets, . . . their feverish interviews with Government officials — was responsible for the compromise formula” adopted by the British Cabinet.⁽²⁾

Jewish opposition to the Balfour Declaration sprang from a radical opposition to Zionist ideology. Western Jews considered this ideology a threat to their newly acquired position in the West. In spite of his fanatical faith in Zionism as a solution to the Jewish problem, Weizmann was not unmindful of this threat. He admitted that the last sentence of the Balfour Declaration was so worded as to prevent anti-Semites from seizing upon the Declaration as a weapon that would bring about the disenfranchisement of the Jews.

The dangers inherent in the Balfour Declaration were not only disenfranchisement of Western Jews, but the dispossession of the Arab people of Palestine, and the world-wide discontent of Christians and Muslims who consider Palestine their Holy Land. Cognizant of these dangers, the American Jewish leader, Henry Morgenthau, advised President Wilson against supporting the issuance or the implementation of the Declaration. He wrote to Wilson :

1. - Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, op. cit., p. 208.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 206.

"It seems to me conclusive that the 400 million Christians will assert their interest in Palestine and resent any attempt on the part of the Jews to dominate that province. The Christians, Mohammedans and Jews must be treated alike."⁽¹⁾

1. Manuel, Frank E., *The Realities of American Palestine Relations*, Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1949, p. 172.

IV. ZIONISM BREEDS RACIAL & ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION

David Ben-Gurion has described Israel as a multitude of communities, which have been dissolved in the "Galuth" and assembled in Israel without yet constituting a nation. "They are a mixed multitude, shapeless clay, without a common speech, untutored and rootless, not nurtured on the traditions and ideals of the race."⁽¹⁾ This multitude continues to lack a real and clear sense of identity. The new settler is torn between his previous experience in the "Diaspora" and his new experience in Israel. Sholom J. Kahn, an American scholar teaching at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, describes this conflict as follows: Outside Israel, "the Jew felt himself and knew himself to be a Jew; and it was, in one sense or another, because of his Jewishness that he came (or was driven) to Israel. But in Israel, paradoxically enough, his Jewishness tends to be obscured, to be merged in the hustle and bustle of daily life; and he tends to feel and know himself, less as a Jew and more as a German, Anglo-Saxon, Russian and Yemenite. The result is a curious reversal of roles: from minority-Jew in America, to minority-American in Israel."⁽²⁾

European Israelis have developed a superiority complex toward Asian, African, and Arab Israelis. The state machinery is run by European Israelis. Non-European Jews are denied key positions in the government. In this climate of discrimination, many groups lead a secluded life which is reminiscent of their seclusion in their countries of origin. Many have expressed their preference to return to their original homes rather than continue to live in seclusion in Israel. A typical example is that of Indian Jews, who have clamored for repatriation to India. "Certain elements of Indian Jewry ... staged a demonstration outside the Jewish Agency headquarters, threatening to fast

-
1. Ben-Gurion, David, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, New York, The Philosophical Library, 1954, p. 348.
 2. Kahn, Sholom J., "Israel's First Pentad", *The Menorah Journal*, Spring-Summer 1954, p. 116.

unto death, Gandhi-style, unless they are provided with transportation home (to India, that is) ... a few left their own settlements and chose to settle in Beersheba and elsewhere, with one purpose — not to build an Indian collective settlement, but to earn enough to defray their return passage to Bombay.”⁽¹⁾

African delegates to the United Nations have pointed out that, in spite of Israeli propaganda and activities in Africa, African Jews do not feel that they are welcome in Israel. The Mauritanian delegate remarked that “Israel was even more racist in its policies than South Africa; its European Jewish leaders discriminated not only against the Arab population but also against Jews of Oriental or African origin. Although Israel was conducting a vast diplomatic offensive in Black Africa, it was significant that it had never accepted immigrants from among the thousands of black Jews in Abyssinia.”⁽²⁾

Israel’s policy of discrimination is reflected in Israeli attitudes at the United Nations. The Algerian delegate to the United Nations remarked that “Israel had voted against self-determination for the Algerian people every time the Algerian question had come before the United Nations.”⁽³⁾

There has been a meeting of mind and interest, if not a collusion, between Israeli policy and colonialist and racist policies. The Moroccan delegate to the United Nations remarked: “It was interesting... to observe Israel’s attitude towards the situation in South Africa and towards the questions of Algerian, Tunisian and Moroccan independence, even though thousands of Jews in those territories were to benefit from independence. Indeed, during the Algerian war, European terrorist organizations had received tangible support from Israel and there was now evidence of the existence of Israeli military equipment in Angola.

1. *Ibid.*

2. Special Political Committee, 363rd meeting, Dec. 6, 1962, A/SPC/SR. 363, p. 194.

3. Special Political Committee, 370th meeting, Dec. 14, 1962, A/SPC/SR. 370, p. 244.

Israel's votes on the subjects of Southern Rhodesia and Angola were thus prompted by opportunism and could ill-conceal Israel's history of hostility towards African nationalism."⁽¹⁾

Israel discriminates among its citizens not only on **racial** and **national** grounds, but also on purely **sectarian** grounds. The state oscillates between the "secularism" of its majority party, the Mapai, and the "theocratism" of its powerful Orthodox group. This group has been able to deny Reform Judaism the liberty of worship in Israel. The Orthodox group has also been able to determine the law of marriage in Israel — which prohibits mixed marriages.

Discrimination between Israeli Jews of different origins and different denominations underlies the racial and theocratic atmosphere of Israel which logically and naturally leads to discrimination between Jewish and non-Jewish citizens.

Israel has one law for its Jewish citizens and another law for its Arab citizens. Its Arab citizens are a minority of Palestinians who survived the Exodus of 1948, and managed to remain in their own ancestral home. Israel has treated them as second-class citizens. An official commission, formed by the Israeli Government in 1955 to examine the situation of the Arabs in Israel, admitted that the attitude of the Israeli authorities "tends to make some of the Arab population feel that they are second-class citizens..."⁽²⁾

The Israeli authorities have found in the "Jewish" character of their state an easy justification for their discrimination against non-Jewish citizens. Animated by a totalitarian racist concept of Judaism as a religion, a nationality, and a culture, they seek in their own ways the "Judaization" of all Israeli citizens. In theory, the Zionist state is a democracy. All its citizens are supposed to have equal rights, regardless of their origin, their faith, or their culture. But facts show that the

-
1. Special Political Committee, 369th meeting, Dec. 13, 1962, A/SPC/SR. 369, p. 234.
 2. Weekly News Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 3, March 22, 1956, (Israel Office of Information, N.Y.C.)

policies which have been pursued have been dictated by a blind identification of an Israeli with a Jew.

Israel is the only state in the world where the rights of citizens are under restrictions that are, at the same time, national, religious, and cultural.

V. EPILOGUE

The Israelis have introduced racism to the Middle East under a new name: Zionism. The authentic traditions and ideals of the peoples of the area, as expressed in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, are anti-racial. Palestine was the cradle of Monotheism, which stands for the unity of all mankind under One God, One Truth, One Justice, and One Peace for all. The Zionists advocate one justice for the victims of Nazi persecution in Europe and another for the victims of Zionist persecution in Palestine. In rejecting Zionism, the peoples of the Middle East have condemned its racial approach to both the Jewish and the Arab peoples.

The Zionist racist approach has created greater problems than the one it has purported to solve. Israel has tried to create the illusion that its existence solves the Jewish problem. The truth is that it has given the problem a much more pronounced racial character than it ever had before. And it has distorted the universal spiritual character of Palestine as a land of peace and charity.

Israeli propaganda has not entirely succeeded in hiding Palestinian realities from the eyes of the world. In an article on "The Zionist Illusion", Professor Ch. T. Stace of Princeton University wrote :

"That one nation should by force or threats compel another nation to act contrary to its own will, or contrary to the wishes of the majority of its people, is 'aggression'. It is contrary to the principles of justice, democracy and self-determination in their external or international application. That a minority within a nation should forcibly impose its will on the majority, this is likewise aggression, but is generally called 'tyranny'. It is the negation of the principles of justice, democracy and self-determination in their internal or domestic application. This is the only 'abstract' or moral principle which is needed for the adjudication of the Palestine controversy. And no changes in the local

scene, nothing in the kaleidoscope of shifting events, will alter it. It will not be outdated a year from now or in fifty years."⁽¹⁾

These words, written in 1947, are as relevant to the Palestine problem today as they were twenty years ago. The principles which Professor Stace invoked are still applicable to even the latest phase of the Palestine problem. If the words of a wise man need to be sanctioned by history, the wisdom of Professor Stace was translated into the resolution concerning Palestine which was adopted by the Second Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Cairo in October, 1964. Based on the same principles which inspired the statement of Professor Stace, the resolution states :

"The Conference condemns the imperialistic policy pursued in the Middle East and, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, decides to :

"1. Endorse the full restoration of all the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to their homeland, and their inalienable right to self-determination.

"2. Declare their full support to the Arab people of Palestine in their struggle for liberation from colonialism and racism."

1. Stace, Ch. T., "The Zionist Illusion", *The Atlantic Monthly* February, 1947.

P. L. O. Research Center
606 Sadat St., Beirut
Established in February 1965
PUBLICATIONS

1. Palestine chronology 1965 :

- 1 - 1 Jan - 15 Feb. (Arabic)
- 2 - 16 Feb. - 31 March (Arabic)
- 3 - 1 April - 15 May (Arabic)
- 4 - 16 May - 30 June (Arabic)
- 5 - 1 July 15 Aug. (Arabic)

2. Facts & Figures :

- 1 - Do you know? Twenty Basic Facts About the Palestine Problem (Arabic, English, French, & Spanish).
- 2 - The United Nations & The Palestine Question (English, French, & Spanish).
- 3 - Discrimination in Education Against the Arabs in Israel (English).
- 4 - Israel in the International Field (Arabic).
- 5 - The Palestine Problem in 33 International Conferences 1954 - 1966 (Arabic).

3. Palestine Essays :

- 1 - The Concepts & Slogans of Bourguibism (Arabic).

4. Palestine Monographs :

- 1 - Zionist Colonialism in Palestine (Arabic, English, & French).
- 2 - Zionist Expansionist Policy (Arabic).

5. Palestine Books :

- 1 - The Israeli Economy (Arabic).
- 2 - The Arabs & the Vatican & Israel (Arabic).

6. Six - Color Map of Palestine (100 x 40 cms.)